

her, which the Chairman ruled was good, and to the charges, which he said they had no power to amend.

Mr. Bertram, solicitor to the Board, then read the charge, and questioned Dr. Macrory, Inspector of Midwives under the L.C.C. whether notice of intention to practise was given by Miss A. J. Beatty, and whether she had ever seen Miss Beatty at her house or elsewhere. Dr. Macrory said she saw Miss Beatty on January 20th, 1912, when she called at her house. Miss Beatty opened the door about a foot, and she told her that the L.C.C. wished her to inspect her, and see her appliances. Miss Beatty replied that she had told the L.C.C. from the beginning that she would not be inspected, and further that midwives should be inspected by midwives, not by medical women.

Two other attempts at inspection in 1914 had no result, though appointments were previously made by letter, one being registered, for which Miss Beatty's signed receipt was produced.

Mr. Bertram submitted that this amounted to refusal to give the inspector reasonable facilities.

Miss Beatty questioned Dr. Macrory as to a document which she had before her, and the doctor said she wrote it on January 20th, 1912, in the street. "Not in the grocer's shop where you went to make enquiries?" asked Miss Beatty.

Dr. Macrory said that she asked on one occasion at the grocer's shop whether they believed Miss Beatty took cases, and they said they believed she did. Miss Beatty enquired: "Did you ask them what kind of case?" and further whether the doctor was a personal friend of Miss Rosalind Paget's, and she replied that she lectured at the Midwives' Institute. Asked how she got hold of the letter mentioned in the affidavit, she said that the letter came from the Midwives' Institute. Mr. Bertram said the letter was not before the Board, and the Chairman told Miss Beatty that all she had to meet was the charge formulated. Questioned further as to her power to inspect Miss Beatty's place of residence, Dr. Macrory considered that she had the power, otherwise she could not see her bag of appliances, &c. Miss Beatty retorted that she could see them in the street, and Dr. Macrory replied that it was the first time it had ever been suggested to her; most midwives would not like it.

Miss Beatty enquired whether she employed a detective. Also whether a gentleman then sitting behind her was a detective, and whether she instructed a detective to come after her? Mr. Bertram interposed that the gentleman referred to was an official of the L.C.C., and the question was not fair. As, however, the fact was not denied, and the solicitor for the prosecution intervened to prevent the witness replying, the assumption is that he was.

Miss Beatty enquired whether Dr. Macrory had had any conversation with another detective.

Dr. Macrory replied that a detective had reported to her that he could not learn that she took any cases.

In the course of further questioning Miss Beatty said that she put it to the Inspector that her visit of inspection was the result of a letter she received from the Midwives' Institute.

Miss Beatty then asked Mr. Duncan, Secretary to the Board, whether he remembered her calling with her certificate at the time of registering, and the reason she gave for refusing inspection. Mr. Duncan replied that he remembered several visits from her, but not that one in particular.

Miss Beatty asserted that the action taken by the Board against her was not taken in the public interest, but really at the instigation of those who had endeavoured to ruin her.

Some of those present knew the late Charles Cullingworth. She had said that she would never practise under the Midwives Bill, which was really his Bill. She asserted that she had been asked by emissaries from the Midwives' Club whether she would take midwifery cases, as a snare, to see if she would. But she had never worked under the Act, and never touched a woman since it came into force. She had never yet been asked whether she practised. She gave notice of intention to practise each year, as a measure of protection in the event of a situation arising necessitating her taking a case; but she reaffirmed that, though it had cost her £50 to qualify as a midwife, she had never taken one midwifery case since the passing of the Act.

After deliberating, the Chairman said that the Board considered the charges proved, but postponed sentence until after the next Penal Board, and asked for a report from the Local Supervising Authority, in three months' time, as to her refusal of inspection.

The Chairman informed Miss Beatty that she was in rather an anomalous position. She had given notice of her intention to practise, and thereby rendered herself liable to inspection. The Board would do nothing until the next meeting of the Penal Board in February. Supposing she did not give notice of her intention to practise in January then no action would be taken.

Miss Beatty asked, supposing that she did not give notice, and she took a case, what would be her position? Mr. Duncan said that she would have to notify that she had done so within twenty-four hours.

In connection with a case in the county of Durham, the evidence of a Health Visitor was put in that the baby's eyes, which were inflamed and discharging, were being washed with breast milk, and that she advised that they should be bathed with boracic, and that if they did not improve that a doctor should be sent for. The Board passed a Resolution directing the attention of the Durham County Council to the action of the Health Visitor.

*previous page*

*next page*